

REMARKS

Claims 65-75, 81 and 82 are currently pending. Claims 65 and 71 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. Claims 81 and 82 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, at paragraphs [0007]-[0009], [0014]-[0029], [0048]-[0056]; Figures 1-3; and original claims 1, 7 and 9 of the published application. These amendments do not constitute new matter.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 65-75 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, for lack of adequate written description of step (c) in claims 65 and 71 and step (d) in claim 65. The Examiner contends this is a new matter rejection.

A. Step (c) is adequately described in the Application as filed

The Examiner has rejected claims 65 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, for lack of adequate written description of step (c) in claims 65 and 71. The Examiner contends that the cites refer to a specific example (Example 6) of producing human Langerhans cells by a specific method and cannot support the more generic claims as instantly recited. The Examiner also contends that the specification discloses a generic morphological analysis, but fails to describe “what the analysis encompasses,” and fails to disclose a specific morphological analysis to look for dendritic processes.

In response, claims 65 and 71 have been amended to recite “performing a morphological analysis of the *in vitro* generated dendritic Langerhans type cells” in step (c). This step as amended is described throughout the application as filed at, for example, paragraphs [0018], [0024], [0028], [0048]-[0049], [0053]-[0056]; Figures 1 and 3; and original claims 7 and 9 of the published application. Thus, the application as filed provides sufficient written

description or support for step (c) in claims 65 and 71 as amended to convey to a person skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the invention claimed in claims 65 and 71, and their dependent claims 66-70 and 72-75.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for lack of written description of step (c) in claims 65 and 71.

B. Step (d) is adequately described in the Application as filed

The Examiner has rejected claims 65-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, for lack of adequate written description of step (d) in claim 65 because the specification only discloses immunophenotyping on human monocyte-derived dendritic Langerhans cells and not the generic mammalian dendritic Langerhans cells of claim 65. The Examiner has withdrawn a similar rejection of claim 71 for the recitation of step (d).

In response, claim 65 has been amended to recite “performing flow cytometric analysis of the *in vitro* generated dendritic Langerhans type cells” in step (d). This step as amended is described throughout the application as filed at, for example, paragraphs [0019], [0029], [0050]-[0054]; Figure 2; and original claims 7 and 9 of the published application. Thus, the application as filed provides sufficient written description or support for step (d) in claim 65 as amended to convey to a person skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the invention claimed in claim 65, and its dependent claims 66-70.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for lack of written description of step (d) in claim 65.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the foregoing amendments and remarks into the file of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the remaining rejections is also requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or refund any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,



Ling Zhong
Patent Office Reg. No. 48,290

Lisa B. Kole
Patent Office Reg. No. 35,225
(212) 408-2628
Attorneys for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112--4498